REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7, 13-17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Noble. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to include features of claim 7. Claim 1 now recites "said analysis file containing mathematics representing the model surface." Noble fails to teach this feature. In applying Noble, the Examiner cites to polygon and trapezoid files 2235 as corresponding to the analysis file containing mathematics representing the model surface. These polygon and trapezoid files, however, are spatial files, not mathematical files. Noble describes these files as including visible layer information (col. 20, lines 45-47). Thus, Noble fails to teach an analysis file including a mathematics representing the model surface.

For the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Noble. Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Noble for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1. Claims 13-17 include features similar to those discussed with reference to claim 1 and are patentable over Noble for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1.

Claims 10-11 and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rosenberg. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 10 recites "determining the distance between the surface on said model enclosed by said at least one target volume and said point on said physical object." In the invention of claim 10, the physical object may have surface dimensions different than the CAD model. The physical object is compared to a model to determine if the physical object meets the dimensional tolerances of the CAD model. This processing does not

FAO-0019
Faro   10

occur in Rosenberg. In Rosenberg, the mesh representation is generated by running a stylus over the physical object. Since the mesh representation is determined directly from the physical object, there is no reason in Rosenberg for a dimension to exist between the surface of the physical object and a surface of the mesh representation. The Examiner cites to col. 10, lines 19-25, but this section of Rosenberg details how coordinates are taken on the physical object, not determining a distance between a surface of the physical object and a surface of the mesh representation.

For the above reasons, claim 10 is patentable over Rosenberg. Claim 11 depends from claim 10 and is patentable over Rosenberg for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 10. Claims 22-23 include features similar to those discussed with reference to claim 10 and are patentable over Rosenberg for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 10.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is requested.

If there are any fees due in connection with this response, please charge such fees to deposit account 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By:_____

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 23413

Date: October 30, 2003

FAO-0019
Faru   11